

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are currently pending in the patent application. The Examiner has objected to all of the claims for informalities. By this Amendment, Applicants amend the language of the preambles of the claims to appropriately refer to "The" article of manufacture, method or system.

The Examiner has finally rejected Claims 1-30 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over the teachings of the Vogt patent publication. The Vogt patent publication is directed to a system wherein a client server system "provides a virtual meeting place for a learning community and a structure through which that community can achieve its goals". What Vogt provides is a community bulletin board for users/members of the community to post their profiles (paragraph [0032]) and input on subjects selected by the facilitator (paragraphs [0031] and [0033]). Users can input climate, or mood, information on various subject areas and the facilitators review the climate information as necessary to identify any problems requiring correction (paragraph [0035]). Further, users can enter a "chat room" to directly correspond with each other.

Applicants respectfully assert that the Vogt bulletin board and chat room teachings do not obviate the invention as claimed. The Vogt method does not automatically create an instance of an online meeting, the instance including graphical depictions of separate meeting phases with users indicated for the respective meeting phase that the users are viewing. Rather, Vogt requires a human facilitator to input content to a bulletin board and invite users to access the bulletin board. Further, Vogt does not automatically create an agenda of meeting phases. Rather, Vogt's human facilitator or convener predetermines the activities for a posting (paragraph [0023]). Applicants further assert that the Vogt system and method does not depict received user input in a graphical representation including a set of objects for showing updated meeting information. The cited paragraph [0034] teaches a "relationship status graph" which includes information about user communications which include a certain number of words. Clearly Vogt is not teaching depicting any received user input in a graphical representation. Finally, Applicants assert that Vogt does not teach or suggest forwarding a generated representation to at least one user for display and user access at the user information

processing device. Vogt's system simply posts information to the bulletin board.

For a determination of obviousness, the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art" (In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970). If the cited references fail to teach each and every one of the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established by the Examiner. The Federal Circuit has further stated that a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. In re Bell, 991 F.2d 781, 783, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993). A proper *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art absent some teaching, incentive, or suggestion supporting the combination. In re Napier, 55 F.3d 610, 613, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1782, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1995); In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 834, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Since the Vogt patent publication does not teach or suggest all of the

claim features, it cannot be concluded that the claims are obviated by Vogt.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections, and issuance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

T. Erickson, et al

By: /Anne Vachon Dougherty/
Anne Vachon Dougherty
Registration No. 30,374
Tel. (914) 962-5910